

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

JESSICA SLIVAK, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Case No.

16

5050

Plaintiff(s)

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

v.

CHESTER COUNTY AREA AIRPORT AUTHORITY,

Jury Trial Demanded

Defendant

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Jessica Slivak ("Plaintiff" or "Slivak"), on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated and alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- 1. Plaintiff is an "individual with a disability" as that term is understood pursuant to Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq., and its implementing regulations.
- 2. Plaintiff, a forty-one year old female individual, was born with Osteogenesis Imperfecta (aka brittle bone disease), which requires her to use a wheelchair on a daily basis. Indeed, for mobility, Plaintiff has used a wheelchair for her entire adult life.
- 3. Plaintiff leads an active life. She maintains her career as a Speech-Language Pathologist, while actively serving on various committees in her church and being a wife and mother of three children.
 - 4. Accordingly, Plaintiff is routinely traveling for work, family, and social functions.
 - 5. To facilitate this active lifestyle, Plaintiff maintains a specially modified mini-van

with an automatic side-ramp, allowing Plaintiff to wheel herself into and out of her vehicle so as to permit her to travel independently.

- 6. Naturally, this vehicle is registered as a handicap vehicle with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania's Department of Transportation and, consequently, bears a handicap license plate.
- 7. Because of her vehicle's sideramp, Plaintiff requires the use of "van accessible" handicapped parking spaces in order to provide her with sufficient space for access to and from her motor vehicle.
- 8. As set forth below, Plaintiff was denied full access to Defendant's facilities due to their non-compliance with the ADA. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with the ADA's regulations regarding handicap parking. As such, Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated the ADA and its implementing regulations.
- Unless Defendant corrects the access barriers detailed herein, Plaintiff will be denied safe and full access to Defendant's facilities.
- 10. The ADA permits private individuals, such as Plaintiff, to bring suit in federal court so as to compel compliance with the ADA.
- 11. Accordingly, and on behalf of a class of similarly situated individuals, Plaintiff seeks: (i) a declaration that Defendant's facilities violate federal law as described; and (ii) an injunction requiring Defendant to remove the identified access barriers so that they are fully accessible to, and independently usable by, physically-impaired individuals such as Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.
- 12. Plaintiff also requests that once Defendant is fully in compliance with the requirements of the ADA, the Court retain jurisdiction for a period of time to be determined to

ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will, in fact, cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 13. This Court has federal question jurisdiction over the ADA claims asserted herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.
- 14. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and Defendant maintains its headquarters and does substantial business in this judicial district.
- 15. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.

PARTIES

- 16. Plaintiff is and, at all times relevant hereto, was a resident of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Plaintiff is and, at all times relevant hereto, has been a legally handicapped individual, and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2) and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 et seq.
- 17. Defendant Chester County Area Airport Authority ("Defendant") owns the Chester County G. O. Carlson Airport ("Airport") located at 1 Earhart Drive, Coatesville, PA 19320.
 - 18. Defendant is a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(F).

TITLE III OF THE ADA

- 19. On July 26, 1990, President George H.W. Bush signed into law the ADA, a comprehensive civil rights law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of disability.
 - 20. The ADA broadly protects the rights of individuals with disabilities with respect

to employment, access to State and local government services, places of public accommodation, transportation, and other important areas of American life.

- 21. Title III of the ADA prohibits discrimination in the activities of places of public accommodation and requires places of public accommodation to comply with ADA standards and to be readily accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12181-89.
- 22. On July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice ("DOJ") issued rules implementing Title III of the ADA, which are codified at 28 CFR Part 36.¹
- 23. Appendix A of the 1991 Title III regulations (republished as Appendix D to 28 CFR part 36) contains the ADA standards for Accessible Design ("1991 Standards"), which were based upon the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines ("1991 ADAAG") published by the Access Board on the same date.²
- 24. The ADA requires removal of existing architectural barriers in facilities existing before January 26, 1992 where such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181(9), 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv), and 28 CFR 36.304(a).
- 25. Facilities newly built or altered after January 26, 1993 must be readily accessible and usable by disabled individuals, including individuals who use wheelchairs. 28 CFR 36.401

¹ The DOJ is the administrative agency charged by Congress with implementing the requirements of the ADA.

² The Access Board was established by Section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. 29 U.S.C. § 792. The passage of the ADA expanded the Access Board's responsibilities. The ADA requires the Access Board to "issue minimum guidelines . . . to ensure that buildings, facilities, rail passenger cars, and vehicles are accessible, in terms of architecture and design, transportation, and communication, to individuals with disabilities." 42 U.S.C. § 12204. The ADA requires the DOJ to issue regulations that include enforceable accessibility standards applicable to facilities subject to Title III that are consistent with the "minimum guidelines" issued by the Access Board, 42 U.S.C. § 12134(c), 12186(c).

and 28 CFR 36.402.

- 26. The DOJ revised the 1991 ADAAG when it issued The 2010 Standards for Accessible Design ("2010 Standards"), which were published on September 15, 2010.
- 27. Notably, many of the requirements with respect to parking remained the same in the 2010 Standards.
 - 28. As set forth below, Defendant has failed to comply with those requirements.

VIOLATIONS AT ISSUE

- 29. Defendant owns, operates, and/or leases a place of public accommodation.
- 30. Defendant's facilities are not fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities.
- 31. On or about May 30, 2015, Plaintiff visited Defendant's facilities to meet a friend for lunch at the Airport restaurant.
- 32. During that visit, Plaintiff experienced difficulty and unnecessary risk due to the existence of architectural barriers that impeded her access to, and ability to use, Defendant's facilities.
- 33. Specifically, no parking spaces in Defendant's parking area were designated "van accessible" as required by the ADA.
- 34. Section 208.2.4 of the 2010 Standards requires at least one "van accessible" designated parking space for every six accessible parking spaces a facility maintains.
- 35. More fundamentally, Defendant has failed to provide any accessible parking spaces in its parking lot wide enough to comply with ADA requirements governing "van accessible" parking spaces.
 - 36. Additionally, none of the access aisles adjacent to the accessible parking spaces

are wide enough to comply with ADA requirements governing "van accessible" parking spaces.

- 37. The failure to include the proper access aisle constitutes a violation of Section 502.2 of the 2010 Standards.
- 38. Further, the purported access aisles that Defendant maintains at its facilities are bisected by a raised concrete and grass island which contains no curb ramp or cut through, thereby requiring Plaintiff to dangerously and unnecessarily proceed through the parking lot, around the island, in order to reach the entrance of Defendant's facilities.
- 39. Failure to provide a cut through or curb ramps at the raised island constitutes a violation of Section 406.7 of the 2010 Standards.
- 40. Finally, the sign designating Defendant's purportedly accessible parking spots as handicapped accessible is improperly mounted at less than 60 inches high.
- 41. Section 502.6 of the 2010 Standards requires all such signs to be at least 60 inches from the ground surface.
- 42. A recent investigation performed on Plaintiff's behalf has confirmed that each of the ADA violations encountered by Plaintiff during her visit to Defendant's facilities remains in effect.
- 43. Defendant's facilities are within the geographic zone that Plaintiff typically travels as part of her routine activities.
- 44. Because Plaintiff plans to visit Defendant's facilities again to dine at the Airport restaurant, Plaintiff will continue to visit Defendant's facilities in the future as part of her regular activities.
- 45. Upon information and belief, Defendant has centralized policies regarding the management and operation of its facilities, and those policies are inadequate to ensure

compliance with the ADA, as is demonstrated by the fact that Defendant's facilities remains noncompliant.

- 46. Plaintiff will continue to attempt to use Defendant's facilities. However, so long as Defendant continues to violate the ADA, Plaintiff will be unable to use them independently and will be, thereby, denied full access to Defendant's facilities.
- 47. Plaintiff requests periodic monitoring to confirm that the public accommodations are brought into compliance and remain in compliance.
- 48. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff will continue to be unable to independently use Defendant's facilities.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 49. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to Rules 23(a) and 23(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of herself and all individuals with disabilities who have attempted to access, or will attempt to access Defendant's facilities (the "Class").
- 50. Upon information and belief, the Class is so numerous that joinder of all individual members in one action would be impracticable. The disposition of the individual claims of the respective Class members through this class action will benefit both the parties and this Court.
- 51. <u>Typicality:</u> Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. The claims of the Plaintiff and members of the Class are based on the same legal theories and arise from the same unlawful conduct.
- 52. <u>Common Questions of Fact and Law:</u> There is a well-defined community of interest and common questions of fact and law affecting members of the Class in that they all have been and/or are being denied their civil rights to full and equal access to, and use and

enjoyment of, Defendant's facilities and/or services due to Defendant's failure to make its facilities fully accessible and independently usable as above described.

- 53. The questions of fact and law common to the class include but are not limited to the following:
 - a. Whether Defendant is a "public accommodation" under the ADA;
 - Whether Defendant's conduct in failing to make its facilities fully accessible and independently usable as described above violated the ADA;
 and
 - c. Whether Plaintiff and members of the class are entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief.
- 54. Adequacy of Representation: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the class because her interests do not conflict with the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly, adequately, and vigorously represent and protect the interests of the members of the class and have no interests antagonistic to the members of the class. Plaintiff has retained counsel who are competent and experienced in the prosecution of class action litigation.
- 55. Class certification is appropriate pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, making appropriate both declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to Plaintiff and the Class as a whole.

COUNT I VIOLATION OF THE ADA

- 56. The allegations contained in the previous paragraphs are incorporated by reference.
 - 57. Defendant's facilities were required to be altered, designed, or constructed so that

they are readily accessible and usable by disabled individuals, including individuals who use wheelchairs. 42 U.S.C.§12183(a)(1).

- 58. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendant's facilities were not altered, designed, or constructed in a manner that causes them to be readily accessible to and usable by individuals who use wheelchairs, including Plaintiff and the class she seeks to represent.
- 59. The architectural barriers described above demonstrate that Defendant has failed to remove barriers, as required by 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).
- 60. Defendant's facilities are required to comply with the Department of Justice's 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, or in some cases the 1991 Standards 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. § 36.406; 28 C.F.R., pt. 36, app. A.
- 61. Defendant is required to provide individuals who use wheelchairs full and equal enjoyment of its facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
- 62. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and the Class in that it has failed to make its facilities fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who use wheelchairs in violation of the ADA, as described above.
- 63. Defendant's conduct is ongoing, and, given that Defendant has not complied with the ADA's requirements that public accommodations be fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with disabilities, Plaintiff invokes her statutory right to declaratory and injunctive relief, as well as costs and attorneys' fees.
- 64. Without the requested injunctive relief, specifically including the request that the Court retain jurisdiction of this matter for a period to be determined after the Defendant certifies that it is fully in compliance with the mandatory requirements of the ADA that are discussed

above, Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA's requirements that its facilities be accessible to, and independently usable, by individuals with disabilities is likely to recur.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, on behalf of herself and the members of the Class, pray for:

- A Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above;
- b. A permanent injunction which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its facilities into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the ADA, and its implementing regulations, and which further directs that the Court shall retain jurisdiction for a period to be determined after Defendant certifies that all of its facilities are fully in compliance with the relevant requirements of the ADA to ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will in fact cause Defendant to remain in compliance with the law;
- c. An Order certifying the Class proposed by Plaintiff, and naming Plaintiff as the class representative and appointing her counsel as class counsel;
- d. Payment of costs of suit;
- e. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees; and
- f. The provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and appropriate.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

(SIGNATURE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

Date: September 20, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

KALIKHMAN & RAYZ, LLC

Arkady "Eric" Rayz Demetri A. Braynin

1051 County Line Road, Suite "A"

Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006 Telephone: (215) 364-5030

Facsimile: (215) 364-5029
E-mail: erayz@kalraylaw.com
E-mail: dbraynin@kalraylaw.com

CONNOLLY WELLS & GRAY, LLP

Stephen E. Connolly Gerald D. Wells, III 2200 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 275 King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19046

Telephone: (610) 822-3700 Facsimile: (610) 822-3800 gwells@cwg-law.com sconnolly@cwg-law.com

Counsel for Plaintiff and the Proposed Class

0-JHS Document 1 Filed 09/21/16 Page 123f 14 CV - 5050 **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docker sheet. (SEE 1	TIBLICOTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF	THE TOTALL			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
Jessica Slivak, individu situated	ally and on behalf of all othe	ers similarly	CHESTER COUNTY AREA AIRPORT AUTHORITY		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Philadelphia, IPA (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF ASES)			NOTE: IN LAN	of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTUF CASES D CONDEMNATION CASES, UNVOLVED.	
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam	e Address and Telephone Number		Attorneys (If Known)		-
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	C 1051 County Line Road, S	uito "A"			
Huntingdon Valley, PA		aute A			
II. BASIS OF JURISI				RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
U.S. Government Plaintiff	Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party		(For Diversity Cases Only) Promote of This State		
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	Citize	en of Another State	2	
Detendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties	Citize	en or Subject of a		
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	For	reign Country		
CONTRACT	TORTS	ic, polytical prof. in FO	DRFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment ☐ & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise ☐ REAL PROPERTY ☐ 210 Land Condemnation ☐ 220 Foreclosure	PERSONAL INJURY PERS 310 Airplane 362 F 1315 Airplane 365 P 365 P 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 368 F 368 F 369 F	Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice ersonal Injury - Med. Product Liability Subsestos Personal Injury Product Liability Malpractice Injury Product Liability Malpractice Injury Product Liability Malpractice Injury Product Injury - Med. Malpractice	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Railway Labor Act 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION 1 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 ■ PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 830 Patent □ 840 Trademark □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XV1 □ 865 RSI (405(g)) ■ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts
1 Griginal 2 Re	an "X" in One Box Only) cmoved from	Court Reope	ened another	erred from	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
V	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et s	which you are filing (I	Do not cite jurisdictiona	l statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause:	ans With Disabilit	ies Act		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLA UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	ASS ACTION DE	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAST	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNA	ATURE OF ATTORNEY O	OF RECORD		
9/20/16 FOR OFFICE USE ONLY		Ke	Phopping.		SEP 21 2016
	MOUNT APP	LYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

SLIVAK	: CIVIL ACTION				
V. CHESTER COUNTY AREA AIRPORT AUTHORITY	NO. 16 505				
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.					

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

FAX Number

(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. () (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. () (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from () exposure to asbestos. (e) Special Management - Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. 9/20/16 Plaintiff Date Attorney-at-law Attorney for (215) 364-5030 (215) 364-5029 erayz@kalraylaw.com

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Telephone

E-Mail Address

Case 2:16-cv-05050-JHS Document 1 Filed 09/21/16 Page 14 of 14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 16

PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.

Address of Plaintiff: C/O Kalikhman & Rayz, LLC 1051 County	Line Rd., Suite "A" Huntingdon Valley, PA			
Address of Defendant: 1 Earhart Drive Coatesville, PA 19320				
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Chester County				
(Use Reverse Side For	Additional Space)			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	7			
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	a)) Yes□ No ⊠			
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No 🖾			
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Data Tamaiantada			
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	_			
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior	Yes No L			
action in this court?	suit politing of within one year proviously terminated			
	Yes□ No□			
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier				
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No			
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	nts case filed by the same individual?			
	Yes No			
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)				
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:			
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts			
2. □ FELA	2. ☐ Airplane Personal Injury			
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. ☐ Assault, Defamation			
4. □ Antitrust	4. ☐ Marine Personal Injury			
5. □ Patent	 5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 			
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please			
	specify)			
7. □ Civil Rights	7. □ Products Liability			
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos			
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases			
10 Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)			
1 . All other Federal Question Cases				
(Please specify) 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.	CIEIC ATION			
ARBITRATION CERT				
Arkady "Eric" Rayz, Esq. , counsel of record do hereby certi	ījy:			
ursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and 5150,000,000 exclusive of interest and costs;	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of			
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.				
0/00/0006				
ATE: 9/20/2016 Attorney-at-Law	87976 Attorney I.D.#			
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the				
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or	within one year previously terminated action in this court			
except as noted above.	SEP 21 2016			
9/20/2016	07076			
OATE: 9/20/2016 Attorney-at-Law	87976 Attorney I.D.#			